## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/683,660   | 01/31/2002  | Jill Alese Cleary    | 109.0026            | 1469             |  |
| 27997 7590 11/23/2007<br>PRIEST & GOLDSTEIN PLLC<br>5015 SOUTHPARK DRIVE<br>SUITE 230<br>DURHAM, NC 27713-7736 |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
|  |             |                      | ALI, MOHAMED HATEM  |                  |  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| ,  |             | ·                    | 3692                |                  |  |
|  | •           |                      |                     |                  |  |
| ·  |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|  |             |                      | 11/23/2007          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 09/683,660      | CLEARY ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |
| Mohamed H. Ali  | 3692          |  |

| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | Mohamed H. Ali  | 3692   |   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence add  | ress  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>30 October 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A   | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | R ALLOWANCE.   |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or<br/>this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow<br/>places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No<br/>(3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods:</li> </ol>           | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in   | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C   | ice, which<br>FR 41.31; or                                      |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiæs 4 months from the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing da<br>(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE<br>(f).         | ate of the final rejection.<br>E FIRST REPLY WAS F                                   | ILED WITHIN TWO   |  |  |  |
| peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the ped of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL                              | and the corresponding amount of the fe<br>I statutory period for reply originally set i<br>onths after the mailing date of the final re | e. The appropriate exte<br>in the final Office action<br>ejection, even if timely fi | nsion fee under 37<br>or (2) færtsetn (b)<br>led, may reduce an |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any explored a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be a support of the Notice of Appeal or the Notice of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>  | xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),   | , to avoid dismissal of  | the appeal.   |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co   | nsideration and/or search (see NO   |  | because   |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or</li> </ul>   | • *   | ducing or simplifying  | the issues for  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |   | ected claims.  |   |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s   |   | ompliant Amendment   | (PTOL -324).  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | · ——  | timely filed amendm  | ent canceling   |  |  |  |
| 7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   | rill be entered and an   | explanation of  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:<br>Claim(s) objected to:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an<br/>and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>  | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe   | al and/or appellant fa   | ils to provide a  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | -   |  | •   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by<br/>see action dated 7/3/2007(paper number 20070627).</li> </ol>   | ut does NOT place the application i   | n condition for allowa   | nce because:  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| •  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |   |  |  |  |

Continuation of 13. Other: a). Applicant's remarkes faxed on10/30/2007 after the interview have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- b). In response to applicant's Interview Summary dated 10/30/2007 please refer to paper no 20071030 dated 10/30/207.
- c). With respect to claims 1 and 13, applicant argues that Seller does not teach and does not make obvious creating a new mortgage delinquency entry resulting in transmission of an initial report from a servicer to a mortgage insurer, with the mortgage delinquency entry identifying a property for which a mortgage is in delinquent status and details of the nature and status of the mortgage.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Seller discloses workout recommendation (report) from loan servicer is sent to mortgage institutions after identifying the types and status of delinquency from Insurance policy and records (see para 0031, via; the e-MO fast track system using forms and functions 56 in temlpate based application - "using forms"). The workout package is reviewed by mortgage representative. Decisions and negotiated terms are communicated back to the loan servicer by phone and written confirmation (see also para 0026 - "workout recommendations", "hard copy", "package"). The loan servicer submit workout recommendation. If the mortgage insurer's predetermined workout parameter are met, the servicer will receive automatic approval letter over the Internet. If the workout parameters are not met, the loan servicer is offered alternate option s including but not limited to choosing another workout or sending in a full package for in-house review.

Applicant further argues, "Seller does not explicitly address initial reporting of the delinquency". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Seller discloses that once the borrower information is verified, the loan servicer or other user of the system is brought to a web page designed to receive inputs specific to the type of workout as being sought and is designed to prompt the servicer to make change s to the inputted information as needed (see para 0048, lines 1-8).

/lohamed H. Ali

Harish Dass Primary Examiner Art Unit 3692